

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:	§	Art Unit:	2617
Animesh Mishra et al.	§		
	§	Examiner:	Naghmeh Mehrpour
Serial No.: 09/216,483	§		
	§	Conf. No.:	9630
Filed: December 18, 1998	§		
	§	Atty Docket:	ITL.0138US
For: Remotely Controlling	§		P6506
Electronic Devices	§		
	§	Assignee:	Intel Corporation

Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY BRIEF**

Flint only tuncs to predetermined known frequencies. Thus, there is no way to read Flint on a telephone unit "to detect an unknown carrier frequency of a proximate wireless telephone."

In column 4, beginning at line 8, it is explained that the remote "next begins a frequency scan of all its available channels in block 20, in this example ten channels." These ten channels are clearly channels with known predetermined frequencies that the device scan through. It does not scan through every available frequency, it simply scans through ten predetermined, known, frequencies. Therefore, it is unable to detect the frequency of an unknown carrier of a proximate wireless device and does not tune automatically to that carrier frequency. Instead, it goes to predetermined frequencies and never detects any unknown frequency.

The reference goes on to explain "it does this by listening on each channel for a specified time." It does this to determine whether the channel is busy or clear. Thus, all it is trying to do is find an available channel and to do this it goes to known channels to detect their availability.

As shown in Table 1, there are ten channels. The frequencies for these channels are clearly known. Furthermore, as explained in column 5, during a link setup process, both the remote and base exchange frequency tables in blocks 46 and 48. Thus, these channels must

necessarily be at known frequencies or there would be nothing to exchange. See column 5, lines 34-42.


The Examiner suggests that any one of the channels could be the carrier frequency of the next available conversation. But the reference never detects an unknown carrier frequency of a proximate telephone. That is the problem with the rejection and the reason it should be reversed.

The suggestion that the mobile telephone would have to incorporate an extremely large band pass filter to permit all possible frequencies, seems to be irrelevant. There is no reason why the phone in the prior art could not detect any ten channels and this would not require an unreasonably large band pass filter. The reference simply never detects an unknown frequency, but only detects frequencies that have been exchanged and provided by another device as suitable candidates for conversations. Then the system detects the channels with the least interference or the least use and uses them as preferred communication ports.

Therefore, the rejection should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2009



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]